Newcastle-Ottawa scores

Reference	Score	Selection				Comparability	Outcome		
		Representativeness of the exposed cohort	Selection of the non exposed cohort	Ascertainment of exposure	Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	Assessment of outcome	Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	Adequacy of follow up of cohorts
Weber 1979	8	*Truly representative of the average women with CIN in the community	*Drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort	*Hospital records	*Yes	*Study controls for age or internal matching	*Record linkage	*Yes	* Complete follow-up – retrospective
Larsson 1982	9	*Truly representative of the average women with CIN in the community	*Internal matching	*Hospital records	*Yes	**Internal matching & study controls for age, parity, socio- economic status and smoking	*Record linkage	*Yes	* Complete follow-up – retrospective
Buller 1982	8	*Somewhat representative of the average women with CIN in the community	*Internal matching	*Hospital records	*Yes	*Internal matching	*Record linkage	*Yes	* Complete follow-up – retrospective
Blomfield 1993	9	*Somewhat representative of the average women with CIN in the community	*Drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort	*Hospital records	*Yes	**Study controls for age, parity, ethnicity	*Record linkage	*Yes	* Complete follow-up – retrospective
Bigrigg 1994	7	Selected group as only 25% responded to the invitation to participate	*Drawn from the same community	*Hospital records	*Yes	**Study controls for age and geographic	Self- reporting	*Yes	* Complete follow-up – retrospective

Newcastle-Ottawa scores

Newcastie-O			as the			area.			
			exposed			Controls had			
			cohort			a negative			
Cruickshank	8	*Somewhat	*Drawn	*Hospital records	*Yes	smear **Study	Self-	*Yes	* Complete
1995	0	representative of the	from the	riospitarrecorus	163	controls for	reporting	163	follow-up –
1333		average women with	same			age, parity,	reporting		retrospective
		CIN in the	community			height			retrospective
		community	as the			smoking and			
		,	exposed			partners social			
			cohort			class			
Sagot 1995	8	*Somewhat	*Internal	*Hospital	*Yes	*Internal	*Record	*Yes	* Complete
		representative of the	matching	records		matching	linkage		follow-up –
		average women with							retrospective
		CIN in the							
		community							
Spitzer 1995	8	*Truly representative	*Internal	*Hospital records	*Yes	**Internal	Self-	*Yes	* Complete
		of the average women with CIN in	matching			matched for	reporting		follow-up –
		the community				age and parity with the pre-			retrospective
		the community				treatment			
						interval of the			
						same patients			
Turlington	7	*Truly representative	*Drawn	*Hospital records	*Yes	*Unmatched –	Self-reporting	*Yes	* Complete
1996		of the average	from the	·		had			follow-up –
		women with CIN in	same			colposcopy +/-			retrospective
		the community	community			biopsy but no			
			as the			treatment			
			exposed						
			cohort						
Tan 2004	9	*Somewhat	*Drawn	*Hospital records	*Yes	**Study	*Record	*Yes	* Complete
		representative of the	from the			controls age	linkage		follow-up –
		average women with	same			and parity			retrospective
		CIN in the	community						
		community	as the						
			exposed cohort						
	1		COHOIT		<u> </u>				

Newcastle-Ottawa scores

Sjoberg 2007	8	Selected group as	*Drawn	*National	*Yes	**Study	*Record	*Yes	* Complete
.,		only 31% responded	from the	registry		controls for	linkage		follow-up –
		to the invitation to	same			age, parity,			retrospective
		participate	community			plurality and			· ·
			as the			regression			
			exposed			analysis for			
			cohort			smoking,			
						marital status			
						and education			
Albrechtesen	9	*Truly representative	*Drawn	*National	*Yes	**Regression	*Record linkage	*Yes	* Complete
2008		of the average	from the	registry		analysis for age			follow-up –
		women with CIN in	same			and birth order			retrospective
		the community	community						,
		,	as the						
			exposed						
			cohort						
Kalliala 2012	9	*Truly representative	*Drawn	*National	*Yes	**Regression	*Record linkage	*Yes	* Complete
		of the average	from the	registry and		analysis for			follow-up –
		women with CIN in	same	hospital records		number of			retrospective
		the community	community			pregnancies			
			as the			and children,			
			exposed			age,			
			cohort			municipality			
Frega 2013	8	*Somewhat	*Drawn	* Hospital	*Yes	*Unmatched	*Record linkage	*Yes	*Subjects
		representative of the	from the	records		but only			lost to follow
		average women with	same			nulliparous,			up
		CIN in the	community			white ethic			<5% unlikely
		community	as the			group included			to introduce
			exposed						bias
			cohort						
Spracklen	8	*Somewhat	*Drawn	*Compute-	*Yes	** Regression	Self-reporting	*Yes	* Complete
2013		representative of the	from the	assisted		analysis for			follow-up –
		average women with	same	structured		age, education,			retrospective
		CIN in the	community	telephone		household			
		community	as the	interview		income, race,			
			exposed			parity, pre-			
			cohort			pregnancy			

110110000110 01	 01.00						
			BMI, smoking				